

# MONO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

P.O. Box 347  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546  
(760) 924-1800, fax 924-1801  
commdev@mono.ca.gov

P.O. Box 8  
Bridgeport, CA 93517  
(760) 932-5420, fax 932-5431  
[www.monocounty.ca.gov](http://www.monocounty.ca.gov)

## MINUTES

December 11, 2003  
(Adopted Feb. 12, 2004)

---

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Scott Bush, Rick Kattelman, Sally Miller, Steve Shipley  
STAFF PRESENT: Scott Burns, CDD director; Larry Johnston, principal planner; Greg Newbry & Gerry LeFrancois, senior planners; Rich Boardman & Denise Hutten, Public Works; Mark Magit, deputy county counsel; C.D. Ritter, commission secretary

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Rick Kattelman called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** No items.
3. **MEETING MINUTES:**  
**MOTION:** Approve minutes of Oct. 9, 2003. (Bush/Shipley. Ayes: 3-0. Abstain due to absence: 1. Absent: 1.)
4. **CONSENT AGENDA:**  
**PARCEL MAP 34-56/Gnegy.** *Final approval of Parcel Map No. 34-56, which subdivides approximately 0.42 acres in the Petersen Tract in June Lake into two parcels of approximately 9,200 square feet each.*  
**MOTION:** Approve parcel map as submitted. (Bush/Miller. Ayes: 4-0. Absent: 1.) The document was approved and signed by Vice Chair Kattelman.
5. **VARIANCE APPLICATION 03-01/Fettes.** *A request for a reduction in the required 20-foot front-yard setback for APN 16-152-09 on Washington Street in June Lake. The applicant requests a front-yard setback of seven feet in order to construct a single-family home with additional garage space. The parcel is constrained by topography. A categorical exemption under CEQA is proposed. The Class III exemption is for construction of a single-family structure.*

Senior Planner Gerry Le Francois summarized the project and provided additional photos, including an aerial view of the surrounding properties and access. Figure 1 illustrates the areas where the proposed structure would encroach into the required 20' front-yard setback. Impeding Fettes' plans is an existing recognized right of way, non-permitted road accessing an upper parcel. If a variance were granted, all future improvements would require grading and building permits.

### OPEN PUBLIC HEARING:

Rich Boardman, Public Works director, noted that if a variance were granted, a grading permit would deal with retaining the existing bank. But what comes first, the grading permit or the variance?

Ian Fettes, applicant, indicated the lower garage area as primary access so he would not be dependent on winter access via the top portion of the steep lot. He would get two garages, but no room for storage, so a third garage would have storage potential. The ramp exists as a fact of life; this proposal allows working around the ramp without modification. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING.**

### DISCUSSION:

A variance makes sense, as the property obviously is constrained, no opposition exists, and the applicant needs help.

**MOTION:** Approve Variance 03-01 subject to conditions of approval. (Miller/Bush. Ayes: 4-0. Absent: 1.)

6. **BODIE HILLS RV PARK LANDSCAPE PLAN REVIEW**

Principal Planner Larry Johnston indicated that a landscape plan is among 18 conditions of the Specific Plan (approved in 2000) that must be met. The landscape plan review is a step prior to starting work on the property. As depicted in the landscape plan, fairly minimal landscaping would retain the natural character of the area. Decorative areas with natural materials are included. The landscape plan was prepared by a landscape architect.

A grading permit application has been submitted, and a temporary construction trailer permit approved. After the landscape plan review, more steps must occur prior to development. Once activity starts, yearly review by commissioners is required. Staff recommends approval of the landscape plan.

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**MOTION:** Approve landscape plan as submitted. (Bush/Shiple. Ayes: 4-0. Absent: 1.)

7. **WORKSHOPS:**

A. JUNE LAKE AREA PLAN: Scott Burns indicated that the Mono Supervisors had requested a refresher on the plan because of Intrawest's Rodeo Grounds proposal. The application is nearly complete, and the developer has placed money on deposit. Intrawest owns 90 acres in the Rodeo Grounds area, where density is 10 units/acre. The plan specifies 90' buildings; now, only 60' height is allowed with a use permit. Design guidelines established by the Community Design Committee are in effect. The Rodeo Grounds could get an EIR certified within a year. The role of Planning Commission would be to review the EIR and development proposals.

Burns presented a power point showing June Lake's extensive community planning. Its current population of 600+ is projected to peak at 12,700. The June Lake Citizens Advisory Committee was the original RPAC and has served as a model for other RPACs. A 1991 EIR inventoried water rights and determined sufficient water for buildout, but groundwater may be needed to supplement surface water. June Lake wants to evolve into a moderate-size, self-contained, year-round community with a critical mass of population. Priorities include not only reducing the demand for outside services, keeping a mountain image, retaining the village as the commercial core, and implementing growth control, but also providing employee housing, emphasizing pedestrian mobility, and linking developments visually.

Johnston indicated a developer would have to request a development agreement to lock in status-quo requirements. Such an agreement would not allow Mono County to change conditions later, but the county could ask for additional special measures. Deputy County Counsel Mark Magit suggested any development agreement be drawn up by County Counsel and the CAO. He indicated that a Specific Plan would have to be in place first.

Burns noted that the June Lake PUD estimates the Intrawest project would use 1.5x the existing village water demand. Intrawest must show it has water for the project and will not impact water availability. Mono County has requested more detail on the source of water.

The employee housing proposal is unclear, but the application is not yet complete. It appears that Intrawest is thinking beds/pillows (resort visitors), while Mono County is thinking housing units (community residents). Environmental scoping would be the next big step, with results forwarded to Planning Commission. It was suggested that commissioners take a field trip to the site and receive regular updates.

B. DESIGN GUIDELINES: Senior Planner Greg Newbry designed a simple, informative pamphlet with minimal words to provide public guidelines on roofs, walls, lighting and plants. If the public has an idea of what is desired, compliance is more likely. The General Plan suggests adopting design guidelines. Next March guidelines will be codified, go to the RPACs for feedback, and be sent to Planning Commission. Scenic Highway guidelines have been adopted already. The pamphlet could be

sent to architects, the board of realtors, RPACs and builders. Other suggestions were to include the pamphlet with building permits, send to reroofers and repainters, include in CC&Rs and design review standards, mail to contractors association, and include it with business license applications and renewals. The wider the distribution, the better. Commissioners commended Newbry on the pamphlet.

8. **REPORTS**

A. DIRECTOR: 1) Environmental scoping meetings will be held next week on proposals in Paradise, Lee Vining and the Mammoth-Yosemite airport expansion. In the past, Mono County has withheld comment on the airport, but will comment now. Public Works has concerns with the access road from Benton Crossing to the commercial area; the sheriff is concerned with emergency response; and a major issue will be cumulative impacts on the unincorporated area. The Mono Supervisors have given no specific direction, but will be part of the process. 2) The Supervisors upheld Planning Commission's denial of the McChesney parcel subdivision in the Swall Meadows area. 3) The housing element is nearing completion for release to the RPACs next month.

B. PLANNING COMMISSIONERS: No items.

9. **INFORMATIONAL**

NOTICE OF FINAL DISPOSITION: Garcia reviewed a Planning Commission order that had been appealed. The Superior Court upheld the Planning Commission's decision, and the owner removed the illegal structure from the site. The judge also upheld the request not to release the complainant's name.

10. **ADJOURN:** 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, C.D. Ritter, commission secretary